

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of Application

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1-49 were pending in this application. Claims 23, 31 and 39 have been amended to correct typographical errors. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-49 remain pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections:

Claims 1-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being unpatentable over Stolfo et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/000293 (hereinafter "Stolfo"). The Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1-49 submitted by the Applicant and Stolfo.

Stolfo is directed to "transactions over a communications network between first and second parties . . . while securing private and personal information specific to the first party or the network device used by the first party with respect to the second party." (page 1, para. 1, lines 1-7) Under Stolfo, communications and/or transactions can be carried out between a user or first party, typically a consumer, and a second party, typically a merchant, over a communication network in which information is provided and/or a good is ordered while securing such information of the first party with respect to at least the second party. (page 4, para. 43) "A user or first party may communicate over the network with a second party, using a proxy. The proxy may provide a different identity for a user for a set of communications." (page 4, para. 47, lines 1-4)

That is, Stolfo teaches anonymizing (i.e., making anonymous) the first party with regard to the second party. (page 4, para. 47, lines 10-11) In other words, the proxy of Stolfo acts as a middleman that hides the identity of the first party from the second party. However, Stolfo does not disclose associating a first entity with credentials of a second entity and allowing the first entity to access a system as the second entity. Furthermore, Stolfo does not even mention an identity system. The nearest Stolfo comes to discussing an identity system, as defined in the detailed description of the pending application and consistent with common usage, are the systems used for approving or disapproving the first party's payment as summarized in paragraphs 58-62. However, in this case, the proxy simply passes along the first party's information for verification or approval rather than associating with credentials of that party and access the system as that party.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-23 depend, is directed to a method for allowing proxies in an Identity System. Claim 24, upon which claims 25-31 depend is directed to a processor storage device having code for programming a processor to perform a method. Claim 32, upon which claims 33-39 depend, is directed to an apparatus that allows for proxies in an Identity System. Claims 1, 24, and 32 each recite in part "receiving a request for a first entity to be a proxy for a second entity; associating said first entity with one or more credentials of said second entity without authenticating said first entity as said second entity; and allowing said first entity to use said Identity System as said second entity based on said one or more credentials of said second entity." Stolfo does not disclose associating a first entity with credentials of a second entity and allowing the first entity to access a system as the second entity. Rather, Stolfo teaches anonymizing the first party with regard to the second party.. Furthermore, Stolfo does not relate to or even mention an identity system. For at least these reasons, claims 1-39 are distinguishable from Stolfo and should be allowed.

Claim 40, upon which claims 41-44 depend are directed to a method for allowing proxies in a system. Claim 45, upon which claims 46-49 depend, is directed to a processor

storage device having code for programming a processor to perform a method. Both claim 40 and 45 recite in part "receiving an indication that a first entity can be a proxy for a second entity, said indication is from said second entity; receiving an indication from said first entity to become said proxy for said second entity; associating said first entity with one or more credentials of said second entity without authenticating said first entity as said second entity; and allowing said first entity to use said system as said second entity based on said one or more credentials of said second entity." Stolfo does not disclose associating a first entity with credentials of a second entity and allowing the first entity to use a system as the second entity. Rather, Stolfo teaches anonymizing the first party with regard to the second party. For at least these reasons, claims 40-49 are distinguishable from Stolfo and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)

Attachments

WJD:sbm

60519147 v1